

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiffs,

CRIM. CASE NO. 10-20202

v.

PAUL D. BORMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

MARILYN WHITE,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SENTENCE**

On August 1, 2011, the Court sentenced Defendant Marilyn White to incarceration for a period of 21 months, three years of supervised release, \$100 special assessment, and restitution of \$3,322,000.

On August 12, 2011, Defendant filed a Motion for Reconsideration.

Local Court Rule 7.1(h)(3) states that in a Motion for Reconsideration, “the movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties . . . entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled, but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.”

Defendant asserts that the amount of restitution was incorrect, and that Defendant should receive compensation for the work that she allegedly performed under the fraudulent deal.

This motion came after a similar argument was raised to the Court by co-defendant Sally Jo Bond; the Court rejected Bond’s argument.

Defendant White “is requesting that the Court review the financial documentation of the Government.” (Motion P.3) The Court has done so, and denies Defendant’s Motion to Reduce Sentence.

The Court further concludes that there is no palpable defect in the sentence, nor has the Court been misled by any defect, nor is there any basis for a different disposition of the sentence.

Defendant White and her co-defendants defrauded the Detroit Public Schools out of \$3.32 million dollars.

Defendant received a significant reduction in her sentence for her cooperation by a Government 5K motion under the guidelines, and by the Court’s ultimate sentence having considered the Sentencing Guidelines and the factors contained in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

Finally, the worksheets attached to Defendant’s Rule 11 plea agreement, which she acknowledged and signed state her acknowledgment that her case involved a program fraud of more than \$3 million.

Accordingly, Defendant’s Motion for Reconsideration of her sentence is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

DATED:

9-15-11



---

PAUL D. BORMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE